Abstract of Vol.10, Sep.1992

SUMMARIES

Gods in the Iliad - The Glass Reflecting the Human World

Yuka Wakimoto

In the first Book of the Iliad, Apollo, Athena and Thetis intervene in human affairs, just as, in the last Book, Thetis, Iris and Hermes do. However, the important difference between the divine interventions in Book I and those in Book XXIV is that, while all those in Book I are out of personal motives, those in Book XXIV are by order of Zeus. This difference, in fact, parallels how the story develops; Book I is the beginning of a disturbance, while Book XXIV is its end. The former is dynamic and the latter static.

The manner of divine intervention reflects the condition of the human world, and the private interventions and those by Zeus frame the course of the progression from the energetic Book to the tranquil Book.

The condition of the divine world parallels that of the human world as a glass reflects an image, and foreshadows how the story will develop.

In Books XIII-XV, a lengthy exposition of divine revolts against the Plan of Zeus unfolds. In Books XIII-XIV, Poseidon intervenes against the will of Zeus in battle, and, in Book XIV, Hera supports his intervention. Finally, in Book XV, Zeus sends Iris and Apollo into the battlefield, which dispatch marks a period of successive revolts. These private interventions by Poseidon and Hera (Books XIII-XIV) and those at the will of Zeus by Iris and Apollo (Book XV) frame the sequence of events in the same manner as Books I and XXIV frame the entire story of the Iliad.

The Iliad is said to be a succession of numberless retardations, and we can say that the chronicle of revolts in Books XIII-XV is but one of them. The personal interventions in Books XIII-XIV constitute one long

retardation, which the interventions of Zeus in Book XV end. On the other hand, the story of the Iliad itself can also be said to be one retardation preceding the fall of Troy. We can also say, then, that Book I, which relates the cause of one retardation, and Book XXIV, which concludes it, together likewise frame it.

Moreover, the activities of the gods function to clarify events in the human world by reflecting its state. In the descriptions of battles (13.455-520 and 13.526-554), for example, while the Greeks and Trojans seem as if they are equally matched, through the description of the gods (13.521-525), we are given to understand that the Trojans are in fact inferior to their enemies.

According to Whitman, there can often be found in Zeus a reflection of the characteristics of Achilles. Is this relation between Zeus and Achilles really constant? The first apparent reflection of Zeus appears in Book XIV; when Zeus falls asleep, Hector falls in battle, and when Zeus awakens, Hector recovers his senses. Certain passages (15.610-612, 15.636-637, and 15.693-695) reinforce this close connection between Zeus and Hector. Zeus and Achilles, on the other hand, begin to seem like two symmetrically opposed figures. In Book XV, Zeus takes pity upon Hector (15.12) and allows the Trojans to recover from defeat, while, in Book XVI, Achilles, out of pity for Patroclus, aids the Greeks.

At 17.591-594, Hector and Zeus are both described with a motif of "cloud and flash", and here the reflection of Zeus in Hector is noticeable. The description of Achilles (18.22) employing the motif of "cloud" is similar to that of Hector (17.591), returning the reflection of Zeus to Achilles. Moreover, at 18.203-206, Achilles is described with an element of "cloud and flash" which is very similar to that at 17.591-594 describing Zeus and Hector. The successive repetition of the same motif traces the shift of the reflection of Zeus back to Achilles.

Since Zeus is often identified with the concept of "victory", we may say that this shifting of the reflection of Zeus from Achilles to Hector

and back to Achilles again foreshadows which party will gain victory.

The activities of the gods, as we have seen, function to foreshadow how the story will develop. It was observed in particular that the personal interventions of the gods cause a retardation, and that, conversely, those of Zeus bring it to an end. The personal interventions and those of Zeus frame retardations. In short, the divine world parallels the human world as a glass reflects its image; the descriptions of gods illustrate the events in the human world and how the story will progress. We have also seen that, in the Iliad, a god is reflected in an individual hero, although this relationship is never constant, and a shift in this relationship also foreshadows how the story will develop.

Thus, the gods in the Iliad help the audience to understand how the story unfolds.

The Motif of Death in Tibullus 2.6

Tsutomu Iwasaki

In 2.6.29-40, Tibullus appeals for Nemesis' pity by reminding her of her young dead sister, then goes so far as to make a macabre picture of the bloodstained ghost. In this passage it is difficult to see his true motive for bringing up the death of Nemesis' sister. D.F.Bright keenly observes that Nemesis' sister is an emotional basis for a last-minute appeal, just like Delia's mother in 1.6, and that Tibullus combines such an appeal with the motif of death recurrent in the Nemesis poems to make it effective for harsh Nemesis. And he says, " The result is the dead sister who compels Nemesis into leniency not by her power to persuade, but by the fear she stirs and the punishment she implicitly threatens." However, I think the picture of the dead sister not only frightens Nemesis but performs another function.

The motif of death appears recurrently throughout this poem. The poet professes his wish to abandon love (9.15-6), though he cannot attain

it. To abandon love is death to a love poet, but for Tibullus death will be the only way left in the future to be released from the restraints of Amor. The phrases in 45 and 51 (lena necat miserum, tunc morior curis) show metaphorically that the poet's present state in which love's fulfillment is hindered is an unfortunate death for him. And the poet suggests the course he should have taken in the past (21 iam mala finissem leto). It is his suicide, to which the death of Nemesis' sister corresponds as an untimely death (29 immatura ossa). Therefore her death symbolizes mors immatura with which the poet always meets.

On the other hand, many expressions concerning words, too, can be found in this poem. The poet confesses the feebleness of the words declared or sworn by him (11-4). Dire imprecation and abominable words (17-8, 53) indicate the harmfulness of words. The procuress' lines (47-50) recall the falsehood of Hope's promises (20, 27). All these expressions are related to the negative aspect of words, and this aspect must also be projected in 34 (mea cum muto fata querar cinere). The poet who cannot depend on words with Nemesis complains of his fate to Nemesis' dead sister who speaks no words. As a result she tries to take nonverbal measures. Therefore the horrifying picture of Nemesis' sister is also the poet's miserable state which is shown not verbally but visually.

Minerva and Arachne

Hiroyuki Takahashi

This paper reexamines the Arachne story in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Bk.6, focusing on the deception-fascination by poetry-art which affects the motivation and manner of Minerva's vengeance on Arachne.

Minerva has praised the song and righteous rage of the Muses, which motivates her to avenge. Two aspects are noticed in Minerva on Helicon

who is curious about anything marvelous and eager to listen to the Muses' tales. First, she wanted to see the fountain which burst forth under the hard(*dura*: 257) hooves of Pegasus; a Muse addresses her as a goddess whose valor has led her to greater tasks(*virtus opera ad maiora*: 269); and she asks the Muse to recite their song in order(ordine: 335). These are suggestive of the classical epic that is the kind of song which Minerva wants to have sung. Second, asking the Muses for the causes(cf. *origo*: 262), she recalls Callimachus in the *Aetia*(frgg. 2, 114) and Ovid in the *Fasti* interviewing the gods and goddesses throughout the work; and when listening to Calliope's song, Minerva takes her seat in the light shade(*levi in umbra*: 336). What these imply is elegiac or hellenistic poetry, which Minerva seems to be (perhaps potentially) capable of appreciating well.

Corresponding to these opposing aspects of Minerva we find two mixed elements in Calliope's song: epic pretentions, the most eminent feature of which is the rage of the gods that vindicates their order, on an asymmetrical structure which is "rambling, dragging in almost anything and straying far from its subject" through set-in tales which are characteristic of hellenistic poetry, tuned to the querulous chords(339) which imply elegiac poetry.

What is suggested here? Attention should be paid to the Pierides' accusation of the Muses deceiving the unlearned vulgar with the empty sweetness(*indoctum vana dulcedine vulgus/ fallere*: 309f.). At first glance it sounds false, but "sweet"(*glykys, dulcis*) is one of the characteristics which are highly valued on the hellenistic criteria of poetry, and "empty" may refer to the leisure of poetry; unlike Callimachus or Horatius who hates and keeps away the vulgar(*Carm.* 3.1.1), *doctus* as he is, Ovid is proud of his popularity all over the world; and deception can mean fascination by poetry, as the Muses "have the skill to tell lies similar to the truth" (Hesiod. *Theog.* 27). Then, the accusation seems to point accurately to the nature of Ovid's poetry, and to turn out

to be true. That is, Minerva is deceived by Calliope's song in the meaning that she is so fascinated by its charm (which she has the capability to really enjoy) that she thinks it was the epic, but it is actually not.

Deceived(fascinated) this way, Minerva wants to be praised as she praised the Muses' song and rage. Here her thoughts do not follow the usual pattern of vengeance stories where human arrogance causes divine anger at the start, resulting in punishment of the *hybris*. As her motive to avenge comes first the common desire for her own praise, and in order to avenge she finds Arachne to be an appropriate victim. And Ovid's expression in lines 3-4 shows humorously the change of her state of mind from praising to being praised: when she wants to be praised(*laudemur*) herself too(*et ipsae*), then, at the top of the next line, the idea that she is a deity(*numina*) who deserves to be praised comes into her mind. It looks as if she had forgotten about it until now.· She can be compared to the audience (*indoctum vulgus*) who want to be the hero on the stage whom they empathize with. Now leaving the theater, it seems, Minerva remembers who she is, a goddess who can actually play the part.

Whatever the motive may be, her vengeance appears to be inevitable, when Arachne's stubborn refusal to yield leads to the weaving duel, in which Minerva's tapestry is orderly in form and content, embodying the perfect classical art, while Arachne's is contrastively chaotic with the various stories of "the divine comedy" scattered in no set pattern of any kind. To our surprise, however, Minerva or Envy couldn't find any fault in Arachne's work(129f.), and Ovid depicts Minerva's act of vengeance in sympathy with Arachne.

The interpretation I'd like to suggest is that as with the Muses, Minerva is deceived again here by Arachne's deceptive art which makes her pictures look real(*verum taurum, freta vera putares;/ ipsa videbatur*: 104f.). Painfully facing Arachne's success(130), which Minerva sees as threatening to snatch praise away from her, she tears Arachne's tapestry,

which is "divine crimes." Here, *caeletia crimina*(131), equated to the tapestry by juxtaposition, and given a position to split the phrase *pictas vestes*, creates an impression that Minerva is trying to shake off a guilty conscience with an excuse while destroying the perfect work of art. Otherwise, Envy could have criticized it the moment she looked at it. And this excuse seems to come as a natural result of Minerva's deception by the pictures, which are so real that she cannot discern whether they are imaginary or real. Then, the tapestry paradoxically proves its perfection by being torn.

When Arachne cannot endure it(*non tulit infelix*: 134) and hangs herself, Minerva feels pity (*miserata*: 135), as if the heroic act of Arachne wakes up Minerva to herself. Minerva, who, charmed by the Muses' song, wanted to be a hero at the start of the story, now at the end fascinated by Arachne's work, seems to be leaving the stage to give away the leading part to Arachne, whose metamorphosis into a spider(140-5) takes place just after Minerva's exit(*discedens*: 139).

If there is any programmatic implication in the story, I'd like to consider it in the same terms as I did in my former papers on *Fama-fama* in bk.12 and the epilogue, where I discussed creative transformation of tradition(*fama*) by the poet(*Fama*) who adds "falsehoods" to "true" traditional stories. Hearing of the rumor of the fount Hippocrene(5.255), Minerva visited the Muses to listen to their tales. Deceived by them, she contributed to creation of a new kind of vengeance story. And when she exits, the rumor fills the whole world with talk(6.146f.)

The Rape of the Lock and the Epic Motive: "Fraud or Force"

Kenji Kamimura

The purpose of this paper is to discuss Pope's use of the epic

motive:"Fraud or Force" in *the Rape of the Lock*.

This motive occurs three times in the Rape of the Lock (2.32, 34, 103), every time in conjunction with how to get Belinda's lock. And the scene of its rape is the climax of the poem. Hence, the motive deserves more than a passing notice.

The main sources of the motive are Virgil's *Aeneid* 2.390 (*dolus an uirtus*) and Dryden's *Aeneid* 2.62 (by fraud or force). The former takes the form of a Trojan, Coroebus, and the latter tha of a mention of the trick of the Greeks, the wooden horse. The trick of Coroebus fails, while that of the Greeks, though disapproved, succeeds. In short, in the *Aeneid*, tricks are never approved, and treachery (*dolus*) is incompatible with valor (*uirtus*).

The question now arises: which is selected, fraud or force, in *The Rape of the Lock*? The Baron's instrument (cf.3.126) is a pair of scissors (3.147, 151), which is called by various names. First, it is called "two-edg'd Weapon," likened to a knight's spear (3.128-30). In epics, to use a spear is to fight by force. Later, the same scissors are called "fatal Engine (3.149)." This phrase comes from Dryden's *Aeneid* (2.60 and 2.345), which refers to the trick of the wooden horse. Thus, to use the scissors is to use both fraud and force.

After the scene of the rape of Belinda's lock, the poet tells of the force of steel (3.171-8). This passage contains the fall of Troy (173-4). Since it is generally believed that Troy was captured by means of the trick of the wooden horse, a simple mention of the sack of Troy would indicate fraud. But the word "steel," like the Latin word "ferrum," can mean a sword, which indicates force (cf.3.178). After all, the method of the sack of Troy is both fraud and force, like that of the rape of the lock.

In the use of the motive: "Fraud or Force," Pope's allusive technique is well displayed. He unites two entities (fraud and force), which are incompatible with each other in the *Aeneid*. Thus, the series

motive in the ancient epic is treated in a manner suitable for the mock-heroic poem.